DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 334 416 CE 058 442

TITLE	Toledo Area Private Industry Council SDA #9. Welfare Coordination Project. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	Toledo Area Private Industry Council, OH.
SPONS AGENCY	Department of Labor, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Feb 91
CONTRACT	4-P9-ZR-WH-00
NOTE	21p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Adult Basic Education; Adults; *Agency Cooperation; *Community Programs; *Coordination; *Employment Programs; Federal Programs; *Job Training; Postsecondary Education; Program Effectiveness; Program Implementation; Program Improvement; *Welfare Recipients
IDENTIFIERS	*Job Opportunities and Basic Skills Program; Job Training Partnership Act 1982; Ohio (Toledo); Private Industry Councils

ABSTRACT

The Toledo Area Welfare Coordination Task Force, coordinated by the Private Industry Council and funded by the Job Training Partnership Act, brought together more than 20 community leaders representing private and public organizations that have a role to play in implementing the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills (JOBS) program in Lucas and Wood Counties, Ohio. From January through June 1990, the Task Force held 6 monthly meetings at which members learned the facts of the JOBS program from federal, state, and local sources; identified operational problems; coordinated efforts to avoid duplication; and set a goal of a coordinated, streamlined system of education, employment, and related supportive services. A consultant recommended continuing the Task Force and making it a focus of welfare reform and improved methods of service delivery. Work group actions and recommendations and the consultant's recommendations were recorded in the areas of access and employability planning, case management, marketing and job development, and research and information. An evaluation was made of the task force's accomplishments; 15 respondents ranked most achievements as average to good. (KC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED334416

Toledo Area

Private Industry Council

SDA #9

Welfare Coordination Project

4-P9-ZR-WH-00

Final Report

February, 1991

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

This project was supported in whole by federal funds of the Job Training Partnership Act (Public Law 97-300, Section 123) and with approval from the State Education Coordination and Grants Advisory Council in Ohio.

CE058442

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

4-P9-ZR-WH-00

TOLEDO AREA
WELFARE COORDINATION TASK FORCE

REPORT TO THE COMMUNITY

JULY, 1990

JOINT EFFORTS TO ACHIEVE EFFECTIVE WELFARE REFORM

Task Force Activities and Accomplishments

- The Task Force has brought together over twenty community leaders representing private and public organizations and institutions that have an interest and role to play in successfully implementing the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills (JOBS) Program in Lucas and Wood counties. Members represent local government, public welfare, secondary and postsecondary education, employment and training, the business community and various social services. Participating organizations include:

  Lucas County Board of Commissioners
  Wood County Board of Commissioners
  Lucas County Department of Human Services
  Wood County Department of Human Services
  Toledo Area Private Industry Council
  Ohio Bureau of Employment Services
  Toledo Board of Education
  Lucas County Board of Education
  Wood County Board of Education
  Penta County Vocational Schools
  University of Toledo Community and Technical College
  Owens Technical College
  Bowling Green State University
  Toledo Area Chamber of Commerce
  Bowling Green Chamber of Commerce
  Toledo Area Small Business Association
  Lucas County Mental Health Board
  Wood County Mental Health Board
  United Way of Greater Toledo
  Toledo-Lucas County Council for Human Services
  Northwest Ohio Health Planning
  Wood County Children's Services Association

- From January through June, the Task Force held six monthly meetings. Members learned the facts of the JOBS Program from federal, state and local perspectives. They identified a number of operational problems they wished to address, including overcoming barriers to the exchange of information among agencies; avoiding duplication of effort in assessment, basic skills training, and job placement; simplifying procedures for both program participants and potential employers. And they set as the goal of Task Force's efforts the creation of a fully coordinated, streamlined system of education, employment and related supportive services. Such a system would assure welfare recipients ready access to a wide range of quality services leading to placement in good jobs with prospects for career advancement. At the same time, it would supply area employers with reliable, motivated workers with sound basic skills.

- The Task Force established work groups to address immediately a list of priority coordination issues in the areas of assessment and employability planning, case management, marketing and job development and research and information. Members and their staff committed nearly two hundred hours to the four work groups, which met a total of 12 times between April and June. The work groups agreed on several steps that are already being carried out and generated a number of recommendations for future action by the Task Force, as described below.

- In addition to serving as a forum for the exchange of ideas and information and a vehicle for joint decision-making among local organizations, the Task Force initiated a dialogue with officials of the Ohio Department of Human Services, which is responsible for statewide implementation of JOBS. The Task Force has urged the state to avoid further complexity in JOBS administration and funding, facilitate coordination among the different agencies receiving JOBS funds, and emphasize long-term goals of permanent self-sufficiency.

Consultant's Recommendations

- **Future of the Task Force.** Continue the Task Force and make it an ongoing instrument of the community's planning, policy-making, program development, monitoring and evaluation activities for "welfare reform." Under Task Force sponsorship, provide for interjurisdictional exchange at both the executive (policy) and staff (operations) levels. Schedule quarterly meetings at the executive level.

  The present level of interaction among member agencies will not sustain itself without an organizational focus. If not continued now, when momentum has been generated, a similar structure will likely have to be recreated at some later time.

- **Recipient Input.** Make provision for JOBS participant input into the discussion of ways to improve program design and methods of service delivery. This may be done in any of a number of ways: (a) by including questions related to training and supportive services needs in the planned survey of how recipients came to be on welfare; (b) by conducting focus group discussions with randomly selected program participants; or (c) by soliciting comments on program operations and proposed changes from participants at orientation, in Job Club, or at other times they are at the Jobs Centers.

  Agency staff have experience working with welfare recipients and are committed to helping them succeed, but they do not experience the service system or the labor

market as their clients do. Clients can be a uniquely valuable source of practical ideas for program improvement.

- **Employer Involvement.** Increase employer involvement in decisions about the way JOBS is implemented by inviting participation at the work group level to address specific problems, e.g. assessment and employability planning, development of the training curriculum, coordinated job development and accurate job matching, post-placement follow-up.

  As the ultimate "consumers" of the "product" of the JOBS program, employers have a crucial contribution to make to its design and development. The Task Force is an appropriate and convenient vehicle for bringing employers into an advisory relationship to JOBS, because it represents the whole range of service providers and funders.

- JTPA's Role. Increase enrollment of welfare recipients in Private Industry Council programs to meet the "equitable service" standard set by JTP Ohio. According to state estimates, 51 percent of the disadvantaged population in Lucas and Wood counties (Service Delivery Area 9) are welfare recipients, and a similar proportion should be enrolled in programs.

  Current state JOBS regulations and guidelines discourage counties from purchasing JTPA services until this standard is met. Pending changes in federal law will require greater concentration on the hard-to-serve, including welfare recipients.

- **Education and Prevention.** Continue to strengthen first-chance programs for students in vocational and general education, traditionally an area American public education has tended to neglect. As the American Society for Training and Development suggests, gear general and vocational education to preparation for further education and training, whether in the workplace or postsecondary schools.

  If the average high school graduate is to have a reasonable chance to achieve self-sufficiency, the economic value his/her diploma must be restored, or at least protected from further erosion.

ASSESSMENT AND EMPLOYABILITY PLANNING

Work Group Actions and Recommendations

- The Work Group included representatives of Lucas and Wood County Departments of Human Services, Private Industry Council, Public Assistance Office of the Ohio Bureau of Employment Services, Owens Technical College, and University of Toledo Community and Technical College. The group met three times, addressing itself to the problems of standardizing forms and procedures and minimizing duplication of effort.

- The group worked out procedures to minimize duplication of aptitude and basic skills testing of JOBS and PIC participants: Program participants referred either for basic education or postsecondary vocational education will be tested by the educational institution, which will report results to the referring agency. Participants assigned to other training and employment activities will be tested, as necessary, by JOBS staff or the PIC.

- Members compared procedures and test instruments now being used by their agencies and is conducting a survey of assessment methods used by Adult Basic Education providers and proprietary vocational schools. Results will be used to encourage use of standard tests and common procedures in order to minimize repeated testing of program participants.

- As a result of discussions in this and the case management work group, the Lucas County Department of Human Services began working on improvements in its methods for assessing the employment and training and supportive service needs of JOBS participants. The department seeks to develop a two-stage process in which a general assessment by JOBS program staff would be followed, as needed, by more detailed assessments by specialists in the department or the agencies to which it refers.

- Following up on previous efforts by Owens and Comtech, the work group recommended that the Task Force support continued action to identify welfare recipients enrolled in postsecondary vocational education and other self-initiated education and employment activities and encourage them to register in the JOBS program. Only registrants can take advantage of the financial benefits available to participants, including expense allowances and tuition grant supplements. Only registrants can be counted by the county and state toward the fulfillment of federal participation requirements.

- Members also recommended that the Task Force consider the feasibility of a common intake form for the principal agencies serving JOBS-eligible welfare recipients. They felt that not having to repeat common questions asked of clients referred from one agency to another would save staff time and eliminate a source of inconvenience for participants.

- The work group urged OBES/PASO, PIC and Human Services, which share responsibility for placing JOBS participants, reconcile differences in their standards of "job readiness." Such differences can cause conflict among staff of the various agencies and result in participants being shunted back and forth without receiving the services they have been told to expect.

- Finally, members agreed that the assessment and employability planning group should merge with the case management group, because its concerns are related and the agencies represented are similar.

Consultant's Recommendations

- **Employability Development Planning.** Base individual employability development planning on an analysis of individual needs and capacities relative to the demands of the labor market. Include use of the "informed decision" process, now required by the state only for subsidized employment placements, to determine wage requirements. Identify job opportunities with potential to meet those requirements. Examine the qualifications needed to obtain such a job and agree on the education, training, work experience needed to meet those qualifications within a specified length of time. Once the gap between the individual's and needs and present qualifications and the opportunities and requirements of the labor market has been determined, a strategy to narrow, if not close the gap can be devised. If the gap is too wide to close within a reasonable length of time from either the participant's or the program's point of view, then interim goals, short of full self-sufficiency can be set, resulting in a sequence of assignments which test the individual's ability to achieve the ultimate goal.

  When employability development is approached in this manner, the question of "job readiness" is placed in the context of individual employment needs, goals and capacities relative to the demands of the labor market. Official definitions published in agency manuals of procedure become less relevant.

CASE MANAGEMENT

Work Group Actions and Recommendations

- Members of this work group represent the Lucas County Department of Human Services, Lucas and Wood County Departments of Mental Health, Owens Technical College, University of Toledo Community and Technical College, Wood County Board of Education, Downtown Office of the Ohio Bureau of Employment Services, Private Industry Council, United Way First Call for Help, and Toledo-Lucas County Council for Human Services. The group met four times and has agreed to continue meeting periodically with its membership expanded to include agencies represented on the assessment and employability planning group.

- Representatives of the Lucas County Department of Human Services, University of Toledo Community and Technical College, and Owens Technical College staff worked out procedures for referring JOBS participants for enrollment in postsecondary education and assuring that the department can monitor their progress, as required by regulation. Both schools will provide JOBS staff with current information on enrollment procedures, confirm all referrals that result in enrollment, and report individual attendance and progress.

- At the request of the work group, the Lucas County Department of Human Services drafted a model non-financial agreement covering referral procedures as well as the exchange of client and program information by agencies serving JOBS Program participants. Agreements will facilitate the exchange of confidential information with client consent and can be modified to suit the parties. LCDHS will draft a generic release of information form needed to implement any inter-agency agreements.

- At the group's suggestion, the Lucas and Wood County Departments of Human Services have offered to conduct a briefing on the JOBS Program for mental health and substance abuse agencies and professionals in the two counties.

- After reviewing JOBS caseload levels in Lucas County, work group members recommended that the Task Force monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of JOBS case management.

- The group recommended to the Task Force that all agencies providing JOBS-related services designate contact persons for exchange of client and program information. They further recommended that the contact people, together with supervisory and administrative personnel from the same agencies, form a permanent JOBS network that would meet regularly.

Consultant's Recommendations

- **Legal Aid.** Determine the need for legal services to increase retention in education and training programs, access to employment, and job retention. Explore alternate means for funding and providing services to meet indicated need, perhaps through a pilot project.

  Cleveland Works, a JOBS-funded welfare-employment program, has found that one-quarter to one-third of its participants face legal problems that threaten their ability to complete training, be placed in jobs or remain employed.

- **Post-placement Follow-up.** Make full use of the opportunity provided by JOBS regulations to offer up to 90 days of post-placement support services, especially case management. If possible, find other resources to continue follow-up for even longer periods when necessary to assure an individual's success on the job.

  Counseling and advocacy in dealing with workplace and life management problems can make a dramatic difference in job retention, the experience of Cleveland Works indicates.

MARKETING AND JOB DEVELOPMENT

Work Group Actions and Recommendations

- Agencies represented on the work group included the Lucas and Wood County Departments of Human Services, Private Industry Council, Ohio Bureau of Employment Services' Public Assistance Office, Wood County Board of Education, Penta County Vocational Schools, Owens Technical College and the Toledo Area Small Business Association. The group met three times.

- Members exchanged detailed information about their agencies' placement procedures in order to encourage simplification and standardization for both program participants and potential employers.

- They agreed to work toward a more coordinated job development network serving JOBS participants and other disadvantaged persons, including ABE/GED and vocational education students. The effort will be based on existing agreements between PIC, OBES and the Human Services departments. Expanding these arrangements to include secondary and postsecondary schools will be considered in the future.

- As a result of work group discussions, the Private Industry Council agreed to take the lead in registering more Lucas County JOBS participants with JTPA, OBES/PASO and OBES Local Offices for job matching and development. Welfare recipients seeking jobs will be registered both individually and in groups at the Lucas County Jobs Center. The objective is to get more information about available jobs to "job-ready" trainees and more information about JOBS participants to job developers.

- The work group asked the Task Force to monitor the progress of further inter-agency discussions regarding marketing and job development.

Consultant's Recommendations

- **Employer Survey.** Survey employer experience and perceptions of welfare recipients, including graduates of employment and training programs, in order to design appropriate marketing and job development strategies.

- **Marketing JOBS.** Involve volunteers from the business community in marketing the JOBS Program and its products to employers, as is being done in Dayton and Montgomery County with support from United Way. This approach is proving successful in overcoming some of the negative images of welfare recipients and their willingness to work.

- **Job Matching Network.** Continue to explore the potential for developing an interagency network for exchange of information on job applicants and openings. Enlarging the pool of information on labor market supply and demand should make job matching more efficient.

- **Transitional Employment.** On a trial basis, create opportunities for participants in publicly funded education, employment and training programs to earn through part time or short-term employment while continuing to learn basic and occupational skills. Allowing trainees to gain work experience at the same time they pursue classroom training, should enhance their career development opportunities. It should also increase workforce productivity and adaptability to the benefit of employers.

- **Human Capital Investment.** Explore the feasibility of adopting American Society for Training and Development recommendations on training investment levels and the proper division of responsibility for human resource development between private and public sectors. These recommendations are spelled out in two recent publications: Training in America: Strategies for the Nation, 1989; and Training in America: The Organization and Strategic Role of Training, 1990.

RESEARCH AND INFORMATION

Work Group Actions and Recommendations

- This work group included representatives of the Toledo Public Schools, Lucas County Department of Human Services, Owens Technical College, University of Toledo Community and Technical College and the Private Industry Council. They met twice and agreed to continue working together to gather information on the educational background and work history of welfare recipients.

- At the request of the group, the representatives from Owens and Comtech completed a preliminary study of the educational background of welfare recipients enrolled at the two technical colleges. Results indicated the students have diverse backgrounds and differ widely in their level of preparation for postsecondary study.

- Members agreed to explore further the feasibility of conducting a systematic survey of welfare recipients to determine the circumstances of their welfare dependency. Such a study could help guide the development of more effective education, training and employment programs to prevent welfare dependency.

Consultant's Recommendations

- **Mutual Accountability.** Collect, disseminate and discuss data on education, employment and training, and related supportive services delivered, outcomes achieved, and client characteristics on a regular basis, at least annually. The Private Industry Council has an excellent client information system, and the capacity of the Human Service system to collect and make available similar information is rapidly improving. All participating systems should be encouraged to follow their example.

  Data on caseload characteristics and JOBS Program participation in Lucas and Wood counties in the first half of the 1989-90 fiscal year has been compiled for the Task Force. Profiles of adult and youth welfare recipients served by the Private Industry Council in 1988-89 have also been assembled. The information indicates the extent of need for education, employment and training needs and is intended to facilitate joint planning to meet those needs. Accurate information who is being served, how and with what results is essential to future planning and program development.

- **Labor Market Information and other OBES Data.** Take full advantage of pending changes in OBES confidentiality rules to collect information on the labor market experience of welfare recipients before and after participation in JOBS and related employment and training programs. Aggregate data on weeks worked and quarterly earnings from the UI system can be used to determine employment and training needs of the JOBS-eligible population and specific subpopulations and to assess program outcomes. Individual work histories can be used for employability development planning.

  Direct access to local job listings will permit continuous labor market analysis and facilitate job matching.

- **Program Planning.** Refine current JOBS Program planning methods through greater use of information on the employability characteristics of JOBS-eligible participants and labor market conditions and trends. California and New Jersey prescribe methods for analyzing the supply and demand sides of local labor markets as the basis for JOBS planning by counties.

  Set policy goals in terms of employment and earnings gains and decide what subgroups of the eligible population to give priority for service. There is no "best way" to design a JOBS Program, only tradeoffs between alternatives, and these should be made explicit so that everyone involved knows what to expect and can fairly judge the results.

FURTHER INFORMATION ON THE TASK FORCE

- The work of the Task Force has been supported, in part, by a grant from the Ohio Department of Education. Further coordination activities, with particular emphasis on job development, will be funded by a pending grant from the Ohio Department of Development.

- The impact of the Task Force activities on the implementation of the JOBS Program in Lucas and Wood counties is to be assessed by means of a survey of members and other agency staff. Results will be available in September.

- The Task Force is also preparing guides to JOBS-related services for program staff and participants and the general public, and it is assembling additional planning information.

TOLEDO AREA WELFARE COORDINATION TASK FORCE

FINAL REPORT

OBJECTIVE V: EVALUATION

Method

All participants, including executives serving on the Task Force and staff members serving on work groups, were sent a written questionnaire prepared by the project consultant. The questionnaire asked them to rate the extent to which project objectives had been achieved and identified coordination problems solved, and the degree to which these objectives and problems remain important and should continue to be the focus of Task Force attention in the coming year. The questionnaire also asked participants to comment on the items and to recommend new objectives and additional problems the Task Force should address. As of October 25, 15 completed questionnaires had been returned of [number] sent out.

Findings

In general, project participants' responses added up to a judgment that the Task Force had achieved its first-year objectives to a moderate extent. Their assessment of the degree of progress made toward solving listed problems was similarly positive but modest. Few would change the agenda set at the beginning by adding to or subtracting from the current list of objectives and problems.

Attainment of Original Objectives. Asked to rate the achievement of project objectives on a five-point scale with one representing "not at all" and five "completely," participants indicated that, on average, objectives had been met to a moderate extent (3.1). Seven of 12 objectives received an average score of 3.0 or better; five were scored below 3.0. Ten objectives were rated "completely" achieved by at least one respondent, five were considered "not at all" achieved by someone. Two-thirds of respondents rated overall goal attainment at 3.0 or better; one-third at less than 3.0. Mean scores for responses on all 12 objectives ranged from a low of 1.8 to a high of 4.3.

Respondents believe the project was most successful in achieving the objectives of creating and maintaining a Welfare Coordination Task Force (4.1); presenting an in-service for management and staff of Task Force member organizations (3.9); enhancing a case management approach to service delivery (3.5); and designing a systems approach to service delivery (3.5). They indicated it was least successful in publishing an operational guide to the JOBS delivery system (2.4) and in developing a management information system, means to acquaint

the community with welfare reform, and quality client and provider instructional materials (2.5). (Three of the four objectives viewed as largely unachieved were tasks assigned to the project consultant that had not been completed at the time of the survey.)

Few respondents offered any comment on the objectives. One noted that the Task Force "started with good involvement but fell off near the end," suggesting the difficulty of maintaining enthusiasm in this kind of project. Another, addressing the question of private sector involvement (3.1), remarked on the need to increase private sector support.

Solutions to Identified Coordination Problems. Participants rated the progress made in solving each of nine problems in a range from 2.8 to 3.7 on a five-point scale from one "none" to five "substantial." Matching their assessment of objectives achieved, they gave themselves an average grade of 3.1 on the entire list of problems, indicating a feeling that moderate progress was made. They scored seven of nine items at an average of 3.0 or better. On only three items was progress considered "substantial" by even one respondent, while an equal number of items received a rating of "none," in each case from only one participant. Also corresponding closely to the pattern of responses regarding objectives, mean scores by respondent for the entire list of problems ranged from 1.7 to 4.1. Four participants rated overall progress below the midpoint (3.0), 11 above it.

Participants indicated the most progress was made in eliminating confidentiality as a barrier to the exchange of client information (3.7); overcoming federal and state barriers to local service coordination (3.3); and reducing duplication of effort in intake and assessment (3.3). They judged the least progress to have been made in dealing with limited availability or access to support services (2.8) and duplication of job development activities (2.9). Four participants had no opinion on progress toward increasing participants motivation (3.0), more than any other item in the questionnaire. Respondents made no substantive comments about any items in this section.

Continued Importance of Original Objectives. Participants were asked to rate the extent to which original objectives remain important and should continue to be addressed. On a five-point scale ranging from one "no longer important" to five "still very important," their ratings ranged from 3.4 to 4.8 with a mean of 4.1 on all objectives. In the minds of the participants who responded, none of the original objectives has become unimportant. They ranked as most important the objectives of maintaining an executive-level Welfare Coordination Task Force (4.8), involving the private sector in JOBS and LEAP planning (4.7), and implementing high-quality,

outcome-oriented JOBS and LEAP programs (4.5). Least pressing, though far from unimportant, they indicated, were presenting an additional "in-service" (3.4), developing a common assessment method (3.5), and establishing an inter-agency management information system (3.7).

Respondents added comments on half of the listed objectives. Two urged that the operational guide to service delivery arrangements (4.1) include program operators and "other affected community agencies" in addition to those represented on the Task Force. While others noted that an "in-service" had been completed, one participant stressed the continuing need for "active" communication, while another asked for presentations by state agencies the next time around. Others who commented pointed out that funding limitations might "prohibit" enhancement of case management (4.0) and that ability to enhance systems and take corrective action (4.0) might become more important as the Task Force refines its definition of the JOBS service "system."

Continuing Coordination Problems. On a five-point scale ranging from one "no longer important" to five "still very important," participants gave the nine identified problems an average score of 3.8. Their mean ratings by item varied from 3.1 to 4.3, a somewhat lower range than the scores given the list of objectives, but as with project objectives, none of the problems averaged less than 3.0 in ongoing importance. Despite progress on some, none has ceased to be an important problem, in the opinion of those involved.

Respondents placed increasing program participants' motivation (4.3) first on the list of continuing problems, followed by setting appropriate educational goals for JOBS participants (4.2), and unavailability or limited access to supportive services (4.1). Lowest on the list, but still regarded as to some extent problematic, were: confidentiality as a barrier to information exchange (3.1); inadequate case management due to lack of information about available services, undeveloped referral procedures and large caseloads (3.6); and insufficient mutual accountability for the quality of services (3.6).

Regarding case management (3.6), one respondent noted the unmet need for written referral procedures. Two others commented on the difficulty of enforcing mutual accountability. Another asked that substance abuse treatment be added to the list of key supportive services. One of two participants remarking on setting educational goals pointed out the need for counselors "to help people raise their. . . personal goals and aspirations."

Future Objectives and Other Coordination Problems. Only six of 15 respondents commented on future objectives, and two of them urged the Task Force to focus on achieving goals already set. Another recommended attention to a coordination activity already underway: the three-way collaboration among Job Service, JTPA and Lucas County Human Services to place JOBS participants in on-the-job training. Remaining suggestions were that the Task Force (1) find ways to include voluntary clients with handicaps; (2) undertake a "more active PR program for JOBS participants and [the] public;" and (3) insure that local agencies are informed of the content and operation of interagency JOBS agreements at the state level.

Even fewer participants suggested the Task Force take on additional problems in the coming year. As one commented, "[the identified problems] are on-going needs." The only recommendations were that the group address (1) lack of information at the local level about the impact of interagency agreements at the same level, a concern of the same person who wanted to add the issue as an objective; (2) "publicity to agencies" and (3) client access to services, both mentioned by the same respondent. The only other comment concerned employment prospects for JOBS trainees: "I remain very concerned about the job market," particularly the need to create employment opportunities at the $6 to $8 wage level. Participants evidently feel that the agenda previously set covers the major issues in interagency support of JOBS Program implementation and is ambitious enough keep them busy for at least another year.

RANK ORDER OF ITEMS BY MEAN SCORES (n)

ORIGINAL OBJECTIVES

Extent Achieved

1. Creation and maintenance of a Welfare Coordination Task Force with executive level representation	4.1 (15)
4. Presentation of an In-Service for management and staff of Task Force member organizations and other community agencies.	3.9 (13)
2. Design of a systems approach to the delivery of JOBS and Project LEAP services.	3.5 (15)
6. Enhancement of a case management approach to [JOBS and LEAP] service delivery.	3.5 (15)
11. [Development of the] ability to enhance systems or take specific corrective action in implementing JOBS and LEAP.	3.3 (15)
8. Involvement of the private sector [in JOBS and LEAP planning] to advise on labor market conditions and training needs.	3.1 (15)
12. Implementation of high-quality, outcome-oriented JOBS and LEAP programs.	3.1 (15)
5. Development of a common assessment method to avoid duplication of effort.	2.9 (14)
7. Development of a management information system allowing for documentation of services delivered by Task Force member agencies.	2.5 (14)
9. Development of a mechanism to acquaint the community with the successes and challenges of welfare reform.	2.5 (15)
10. Development of quality client and provider instructional materials.	2.5 (14)
3. Publication of an operational guide [to this delivery system] for use by Task Force members.	2.4 (14)

Extent of Continued Importance

1.	Creation and maintenance of a Welfare Coordination Task Force with executive level representation.	4.8 (15)
8.	Involvement of the private sector [in JOBS and LEAP planning] to advise on labor market conditions and training needs.	4.7 (15)
12.	Implementation of high-quality, outcome-oriented JOBS and LEAP programs.	4.5 (15)
2.	Design of a systems approach to the delivery of JOBS and Project LEAP services.	4.3 (15)
3.	Publication of an operational guide [to this delivery system] for use by Task Force members.	4.1 (15)
6.	Enhancement of a case management approach to [JOBS and LEAP] service delivery.	4.0 (15)
9.	Development of a mechanism to acquaint the community with the successes and challenges of welfare reform.	4.0 (15)
10.	Development of quality client and provider instructional materials.	4.0 (14)
11.	Development of the] ability to enhance systems or take specific corrective action in implementing JOBS and LEAP.	4.0 (15)
7.	Development of a management information system allowing for documentation of services delivered by Task Force member agencies.	3.7 (15)
5.	Development of a common assessment method to avoid duplication of effort.	3.5 (15)
4.	Presentation of an In-Service for management and staff of Task Force member organizations and other community agencies.	3.4 (15)

IDENTIFIED PROBLEMS

Extent of Progress Made in Solving

3. Confidentiality requirements as a barrier to the exchange of client information.	3.7 (15)
1. Duplication of effort in intake, eligibility determination, testing and assessment of JOBS participants.	3.3 (15)
4. Other federal and state laws and regulations as barriers to coordination of services at the local level.	3.3 (15)
5. Inadequate case management due to lack of information about available services; undeveloped referral procedures; and large caseloads.	3.1 (15)
8. Setting appropriate educational goals for JOBS participants, based on individual needs and interests, existing labor market conditions, and program limitations.	3.1 (14)
6. Insufficient mutual accountability for the quality of services among agencies serving the same populations.	3.0 (13)
9. Increasing program participants' motivation.	3.0 (11)
2. Duplication of job development activities; competitive marketing of disadvantaged groups to employers.	2.9 (14)
7. Unavailability or limited access to supportive services, e.g. day care, transportation, and individual or family counseling.	2.8 (14)

Extent of Continued Importance

9. Increasing program participants' motivation.	4.3 (15)
8. Setting appropriate educational goals for JOBS participants, based on individual needs and interests, existing labor market conditions, and program limitations.	4.2 (14)

7. Unavailability or limited access to supportive services, e.g. day care, transportation, and individual or family counseling.	4.1 (15)
1. Duplication of effort in intake, eligibility determination, testing and assessment of JOBS participants.	3.9 (15)
2. Duplication of job development activities; competitive marketing of disadvantaged groups to employers.	3.9 (15)
4. Other federal and state laws and regulations as barriers to coordination of services at the local level.	3.7 (15)
5. Inadequate case management due to lack of information about available services; undeveloped referral procedures; and large caseloads.	3.6 (15)
6. Insufficient mutual accountability for the quality of services among agencies serving the same populations.	3.6 (14)
3. Confidentiality requirements as a barrier to the exchange of client information.	3.1 (15)